

claims 24-32 and 34-39 (Group II) drawn to a method of packaging product.

The Applicants traverse the restriction requirement because it mischaracterizes some of the claims included in Group II. Claims 34-36 are directed to a method of manufacturing a reclosable bag, not a method of packaging product. Claims 37-39 are directed to a method of attaching a header to a reclosable package, not a method of packaging product.

In response to the restriction requirement, the Applicants hereby elect, with traverse, to prosecute claims 1-23, 33 and 40-47 of Group I. The non-elected claims have been canceled. New claims 48-55 drawn to a package have been added. The Applicants request that these new claims be included in elected Group I.

In ¶ 4 of the Office Action, it has been further required that the Applicant elect one of the following species: (1) the embodiment of Figures 1 and 2; (2) the embodiment of Figure 3; (3) the embodiment of Figure 4; and (\$) the embodiment of Figure 5.

In response to the election requirement, the Applicants elect Species 1, i.e., the embodiment shown in Figures 1 and 2. Claims 1-11, 13-22, 33, 40-50, 52, 54 and 55 read on Species 1.

Furthermore, the Applicants disagree with the Examiner's conclusion that no pending claims are generic. On the contrary, claims 1-9, 13-21, 33, 40-50, and 55 are generic and read on all species. The species identified by the Examiner differ from each other only in two structural respects: (1) the top of the header is either a fold connecting the header walls or a seal joining the header walls; and (2) the header walls are either integrally formed with the receptacle walls or joined to the receptacle walls. These features are recited in only claims 9-11, 22, 23, and 51-54, so all other package claims are generic.

The Applicants hereby request that pending claims 1-23, 33 and 40-55 be favorably acted upon.